

SECOND CAMPAIGN NUMBER

THE REMONSTRANCE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1915

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and thirty six Branch Committees; 35,068*
members in 425 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. JOHN BALCH, President	
MRS. GEORGE E. AGASSIZ	
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY	
MISS ANNA L. DAWES	
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD	
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL	
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY	
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer	
MISS MARY S. AMES, Chairman of Executive Committee	
MRS. WILLIAM LOWELL PUTNAM, Chairman of Education and Organization Committee	
MRS. A. H. PARKER, Chairman of County Committee	
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON, President Public Interests League	
MRS. A. J. GEORGE, Field Secretary	
MRS. S. REED ANTHONY, Rec. Sec'y.	
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y. Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.	

Vice
Presidents

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

A BRIGHT PROSPECT

In April, 1914, The Remonstrance ventured to predict that *"the year 1915 is destined to witness the heaviest defeats which the suffrage movement has yet experienced."*

Now, upon the eve of the elections, The Remonstrance repeats the prediction with added confidence. And it bases its confidence upon a somewhat intimate knowledge of campaign conditions, in Massachusetts especially, but also in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

But it cannot too strongly urge upon Massachusetts anti-suffragists that the aim to be kept steadily in view is not merely to defeat the amendment, but to defeat it by the

heaviest possible majority. It must be remembered, as was urged in last month's Remonstrance, that every vote counts. The enemy most to be dreaded is over-confidence. The only real danger lies in a light vote.

The suffragists are in the habit of describing their movement as advancing by leaps and bounds, and winning its way in one state after another by overwhelming popular endorsement at the polls.

What really has happened is that the suffrage victories have always been won on a light vote and by narrow margins. California, for example, was carried for suffrage by a majority of only 3,500 on a total vote representing only about one-third of the electorate. In Oregon, the suffrage majority was only 3,277, on a total vote representing a little more than one-half of the electorate. The aggregate suffrage majorities in the ten states in which suffrage has been adopted by popular vote amount to only 96,285. This is only about one-half of the anti-suffrage majority in Ohio alone, at the election of 1914.

This is no suffrage landslide. What it points to is not a great popular demand for woman suffrage, but a lamentable failure on the part of a large number of voters to realize the seriousness of the question and to take the trouble to vote upon it. Michigan furnishes a case in point. There the amendment came near slipping through,—the majority against it in 1912 being only 760. But, when it was resubmitted in 1913, the voters were aroused, and gave a majority of 96,144 against it.

Massachusetts men should take the lesson to heart. There are still a good many of them who look upon the suffrage movement with a kind of amused incredulity. They are so sure that the suffrage amendment will be

defeated that they are not giving themselves any concern about it. But, if they maintain this attitude through the campaign, and vote on the question, when election day comes, only if they happen to think of it, they may find, the morning after the election, that the margin on the right side is at least dangerously close.

The only hope of the suffragists, in any of the four campaign states this year, lies in a light vote. Every anti-suffragist should realize this, and should strive to make the anti-suffrage majority as large as possible. If the whole anti-suffragist vote is polled, the amendment will be defeated by a majority so decisive that the question will remain settled for years to come, and the moral effect upon the states which are to vote next year will be most helpful.

THE WRONG WAY AROUND

(From the Newburyport Herald)

Suffrage leaders admit that the women of Massachusetts as a whole do not care about the vote at the present moment. They want to give them the vote and then teach them to use it. That, in our opinion, is the wrong way around. Let the women be aroused and they will get the ballot if they want it.

SAFETY FIRST

IF YOU THINK THAT THE SUFFRAGIST SLOGANS OF "ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE" AND "LIVING OUR OWN LIVES" MENACE THE HOME AND THE CHILDREN:

IF YOU THINK THAT WE ALREADY HAVE PROBLEMS ENOUGH WITHOUT MAKING A REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE IN OUR ELECTION SYSTEM:

IF YOU THINK IT A FOOL THING TO SET WOMEN ON A JOB WHICH IS BEING FAIRLY WELL DONE BY MEN:

VOTE "NO" ON THE SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

GETTING READY TO EXPLAIN

Massachusetts suffragists are already getting ready to explain their defeat at the polls on the 2d of November next.

Evidently, the explanation is going to be of the familiar type. "It was the saloons that did it"—that will be the gist of it.

Here is Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald, speaking at Newburyport on the 19th of August, declaring that all that the suffragists fear is the activity of "the liquor interests, and the vicious interests that focus in the city, all the business interests who will find it harder to control legislation after suffrage is enacted."

And here is Edna Lawrence Spencer, in "Femina" for August, affirming that "The comparatively small number of women who form the anti-suffrage group do not count as a serious factor against which to contend" and that "A cause, no less than a man, is known by its enemies. The white slaver, the ward-heeler, and the other leeches of the body politic are solidly arrayed against equal suffrage. . . . Our real foes never appear in print. They form a part of that invisible government which shuns the clear, white searchlight of publicity, and against which the weight of public opinion has been so greatly aroused."

All this has a familiar sound. It is merely a repetition of what was said after the heavy suffrage defeats in Ohio, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, in Missouri and in other States. Always, it is the saloons that defeat suffrage,—and yet, when the campaigns are in progress, the suffrage leaders do their best to woo the saloon interests and to persuade them that they have nothing to fear from suffrage.

As all candid observers know, there is no need of going so far afield to explain the suffrage defeats. The suffragists are defeated because, according to their own admissions, they include only a minority, and, according to the actual facts, only a

small minority of their sex. When the voters of Ohio, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota rejected suffrage amendments last fall by majorities ranging from 9,659 in North Dakota to 182,905 in Ohio, it was because they saw no good reason for forcing all the women of those States into politics because a small minority of them wanted to vote.

There is another reason which helps to account for the size of recent suffrage defeats. This is the coquetting of the suffrage leaders with the saloon interests—a coquetting which may or may not win some saloon votes but which inevitably alienates temperance votes. Ohio furnishes a striking case in point. Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, President of the Ohio Suffrage Association, published an official statement early in the campaign, in which she said:

"Let me explain that the suffrage association is not a temperance organization. *It has no connection whatever with the Anti-Saloon league.* When women vote they will be free to take sides on the liquor question. Many of them doubtless will vote dry. *Many others will vote wet.*"

The official returns of the Ohio vote on the proposed suffrage and prohibition amendments afford a chance to study the effect of this policy. No better opportunity has ever been given to test the oft-repeated suffrage claim that suffrage and prohibition go "hand in hand," because the Ohio voters expressed themselves on both proposals on the same day, and the official returns admit of comparison, county by county.

The total vote on the prohibitory amendment, for and against, was 1,092,508; that on the suffrage amendment was 853,685. There were therefore 238,823 voters who voted on the one proposal who did not take the trouble to do so, on the other. Both were defeated,—suffrage by a majority of 182,905, while the majority against prohibition was only 84,152.

But the most significant fact disclosed by the returns is that, out of 88 counties in the State, 58 voted in favor of prohibition and against suffrage. Mrs. Upton telegraphed The Woman's Journal the day after the election: "*Drys did not generally vote with us.*" The official figures show that she was right.

Mrs. Upton and her associates seem to have taken no account of the effect which the assurances which they gave the liquor interests might have upon temperance voters. But they can read their mistake in the change from an adverse majority of 87,455 in 1912 to one of 182,905 in 1914. The temperance voters took note of their side-stepping and were not pleased with it.

Massachusetts suffragists are making the same mistake in this campaign. Margaret Foley, Minnie Mulry and certain other of their speakers appear to have been told off to conciliate the liquor interests, and to persuade street crowds that woman suffrage "will not take away their beer." Meanwhile certain other of their speakers keep up the "moral uplift" pretence.

Do they suppose that Massachusetts voters cannot see through a movement which pretends that its opponents are supported by the liquor interests, and professes horror on that account, and at the same time does its best to conciliate those interests and to assure them that they have nothing to dread from suffrage?

Massachusetts suffragists are doomed to a disappointment similar to that which Mrs. Upton and her associates experienced last November. How great that disappointment was may be inferred from the fact that, on the 3d of October, just one month before the election, the Woman's Journal said joyously:

"Ohio is going to win. If Ohio wins, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts will come in in 1915, and the country will have been carried for suffrage."

SOME FRUITS OF "ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE"

THERE is no higher authority on industrial conditions, so far as they affect women, than Mrs. Florence Kelley, Secretary of the National Consumers' League, and trustee of the National Child Labor Committee. What she has to say about "economic independence for women," which is now so strenuously advocated by suffrage leaders is doubly significant because she is herself a suffragist, and a Vice President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

Of the practical workings of economic independence Mrs. Kelley says that "such statistics as have been gathered the world over show that the industrial employment of married women does harm and only harm," and she specifies among the fruits of it: "Infanticide, a demoralizing tendency to husbands, a lowering of men's wages by the presence of unorganized and irregular workers, to which class the wife and mother belongs."

At a recent session of the New York City Conference of Charities and Correction, Mrs. Kraft, treasurer of the Relief Committee of the Widowed Mothers' Fund Association, read a paper on "The Labor of Wife and Children as a Factor in Family Support," in which she quoted Mrs. Kelley's views and strongly endorsed them from her own experience and observation. She pointed out that her now somewhat old-fashioned opinion that the home and not the factory or the workshop is the proper place for the mother is supported by the twenty-three states, including New York, which have passed laws in behalf of widowed mothers, so that they can properly care for their children at home. She cited the experience of children's hospitals, diet kitchens, and the children's aid societies in confirmation of the statement that children where home industries were carried on were seriously affected by the continuous noise, bustle and nerv-

ous tension. She insisted that, if the woman spends with discrimination, conserves the health of her children, her husband and herself by proper feeding and intelligent care, she and the community will be better off economically as well as spiritually and physically than they would be if she entered industrial life, where her entrance would tend to force rents up, and wages for men down, and to develop anti-social habits and an increased infant mortality.

These are sensible views, and they are based on wide observation and experience. But they are leagues removed from the theory of Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, expressed in the *Woman's Journal*, that "The woman should have as much to do in the home as the man,—no more," or Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr's assertion that "It isn't the right of the male to provide for his female," or Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald's appeal: "Do away with the prejudice against married women working outside their homes."

The menace of the present situation is that the suffrage movement is chiefly led and its ideals and policy shaped by women of the type of Mrs. Belmont, Mrs. Dorr, Mrs. Gilman and Mrs. Fitzgerald who make no secret of the social and domestic revolution which they hope to bring about.

A LONG TIME TO WAIT

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT,—as quoted by Miss Alice Stone Blackwell—predicts that it will take at least a hundred years for equal suffrage to wipe out the social evil.

Yet it is the alleged potency of woman suffrage in dealing with the social evil which Massachusetts suffragists are making their chief issue in the present campaign.

Does it not strike Massachusetts voters that it is rather rash to make a revolutionary change in existing electoral conditions on the chance that something good may come from it a hundred years from now?

But, if woman suffrage is to wipe out the social evil, even in a hundred years, suffrage leaders ought to be able to show two things:

First: That there is some definite way in which the votes of women are to achieve this result.

Second: That existing conditions are better in suffrage states than in male suffrage states.

The suffragists not only have not established these points, but they have made scarcely any attempt to do so. Let Massachusetts voters, who have listened to suffrage oratory in this campaign, think over the speeches they have heard, and say whether a single speaker has shown any real connection between the abolition of the social evil and women's votes. If they have any doubt about it, let them ask the next suffrage speaker whom they hear how the thing is to be brought about. Mrs. Catt did her cause a service when she set "at least a hundred years" as the period required to show results. But Massachusetts voters are not to vote next November upon hypothetical results a hundred years hence, but upon present-day conditions and problems.

As to existing conditions, the laws against vice and for the protection of women are stronger today in the male suffrage states, Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania, than in Wyoming, which has had woman suffrage for 46 years, or Colorado, which has had it for 22 years. This, on the impartial authority of the American Vigilance Association. Dr. Helen L. Sumner, an ardent suffragist, writing in 1909 on conditions in Denver, said: "On the social evil, too, it is impossible to see that equal suffrage has had any effect. Women, in fact, have made little effort in this direction." And she very wisely added: "The problem, indeed, seems to be too appalling and too fundamentally difficult for even the stoutest hearts and the clearest heads of experienced philanthropists."

Yet this is the problem which Massachusetts suffragists are lightly promising to solve by women's votes.

DR. SHAW ON MARRIAGE-FURLOUGHS

Dr. Anna H. Shaw's views on marriage have been presented at considerable length in an interview in the Philadelphia North American,—a suffrage newspaper which may be trusted not to misrepresent the President of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

Dr. Shaw regards the lot of the average married woman as so hard as to call for special alleviation. Women in industry,—clerks, secretaries, stenographers, typewriters, etc.—do not look for any favors in the matter of vacations over men similarly employed. But Dr. Shaw is apparently so impressed with the drudgery of a wife's domestic cares that she thinks that they call for special relief. She says:

"I should fix a fortnight's furlough every two months, and I think that this should be every woman's due. It would add to her value. The average family doesn't know the worth of the wife and mother until she leaves the home. They are always glad to have her back. Then again it is good for the wife to get away. As long as she stays in the same rut she loses the sense of her own value, the work becomes monotonous, her nerves are affected, she is always tired and becomes dissatisfied with her own life. The change makes a big difference. It is like the opening of a new page in her life."

Dr. Shaw describes marriage as a partnership,—which indeed it is—but she does not indicate what is to become of the other partner while the wife and mother is taking her two weeks' furlough every two months. Is he to give up his work for one quarter of the time in order that he may do the housework and look out for the children? And how is he going to arrange the matter with his employer? And how is he to compete with other men who are not under a similar handicap?

These and like questions seem not to have occurred to Dr. Shaw. The suffrage shibboleth is "equal rights." But what the suffragists really demand for women, if their national

leader speaks for them, is special privileges which would be destructive of the home and all social order.

HARDER JOBS AND HIGHER PAY

THE suffragists profess to be indignant because, in the departments at Washington, more men than women are employed, and at higher pay. They point to the fact that, in a single year, 2,557 men and 1,146 women passed the civil service examinations, and that of these, 560 men and only 121 women were appointed; and they insist that "never until women as well as men are recognized citizens" will these conditions be changed.

But women as "recognized citizens" will not be free from the natural limitations of their sex. "Votes for women" have nothing to do with those limitations. If the head of a department prefers men to women when he makes a requisition for clerks, it is because he knows that the average man can work harder and more steadily and will stick to his job longer than the average woman. To the average man, his work represents the means of supporting not only himself but his wife and children, and this for a long period of years. To the average woman, industrial employment means nothing more than a temporary makeshift, to be abandoned in a few years for marriage and the home. This may tend to lower women's wages, but it is a good thing for society and the state. That it is something that woman suffrage cannot change is indicated by the fact that the difference between men's and women's pay is greater in the suffrage states, Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, than it is in Massachusetts.

IT APPEARS from the Report of Dr. Josephine Baker, of the Child Hygiene Department of the New York City Health Board, that in 1907, before the Bureau was organized, there were 17,437 deaths among babies under one year of age in that city,—a death rate of 144 per 1,000 births. But in 1914, the number was

reduced to 13,312,—a death rate of only 94.6 per 1,000 births. The amazing gain was brought about, not by the "mothering influence" at the polls or in the legislature, but by the "mothering influence" where it is most needed, in the homes, under wise guidance and with the aid of pure milk.

FEMINIST FRUITS OF SUFFRAGE

(From the Philadelphia Inquirer)

WHEN women are radical, they are very, very radical indeed and they are ready and anxious to venture where their masculine associates, with less courage but more discretion, are often afraid to tread.

There seem to be a good many women of that kind in Norway, who are making their influence felt in the legislation of that country, if the recent proceedings of the Legislature there may be taken as a criterion. Within a comparatively recent period all adult Norwegian women have been admitted to the ballot, and it is a subject of remark that since then the course of legislation has taken a remarkably socialistic turn. If women are supposed to stand for one thing more than another that one thing is the sanctity of the home, but laws have recently been enacted at Christiana which condone meretricious relations between the sexes and which are defended by their proponents upon the ground that legal matrimony has become old-fashioned and that it needs to be displaced by love connections between "soul affinities." It is not known, and there is no means of ascertaining, how far the women of Norway are in sympathy with that view, but its development under the circumstances which have been stated is distinctly disturbing.

DO YOU KNOW

OF ANY REAL GRIEVANCE THAT MASSACHUSETTS SUFFRAGISTS HAVE WHICH EXCUSES THEIR SHRILL DEMAND FOR "JUSTICE"?

OF ANY SUFFRAGE STATE WHOSE LAWS FOR THE PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN AVERAGE BETTER THAN THOSE OF MASSACHUSETTS?

OF ANY GOOD REASON FOR THE SUFFRAGIST ATTEMPT TO ARRAY WOMEN'S INTERESTS AGAINST MEN'S IN MASSACHUSETTS?

IF YOU DON'T
VOTE "NO" ON THE SUFFRAGE
AMENDMENT

OVER THE HEADS OF THE
VOTERS

THE suffrage movement professes to be in the interest of a broader franchise and a larger popular participation in the work of government. Yet its leaders are continually devising means to avoid appeals to the people, and to carry their measures over the heads of the voters.

This was what they did in Illinois. Although, in 1912, they scoured the entire state, and offered one dollar a hundred for signatures, they were unable to get the 100,000 names required to secure the submission of the suffrage question to the voters under the "public policy" Act. At the Chicago primary that year, when the voters expressed their opinion on the suffrage question, the anti-suffrage majority was nearly two to one,—71,354 in favor, and 135,410 opposed—and every ward in the city voted against suffrage. Yet the suffragists carried their bill through the legislature in 1913 by a secret lobby, and the voters were not consulted about it.

This year, in five states—Vermont, Michigan, Indiana, Nebraska and Rhode Island—the suffragists have tried to get through the legislatures, without reference to the voters, suffrage bills after the Illinois plan. Happily, they have failed in every instance.

The persistent attempt of the suffragists to secure their end through an amendment to the Federal Constitution is prompted by the same motive. It is a violation of the first principles of democracy. It is an attempt to take the settlement of a fundamental question of electoral privilege away from the people, and to lodge it in the hands of groups of legislators, elected without reference to that issue. No question of equal scope or equally fundamental has ever been dealt with in this way.

The more candid suffragists make no secret of their purpose in urging a Federal amendment. Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, one of the leaders

in the movement, urges that "women may be spared the ordeal of begging their political freedom from the masses of voters." She thinks it "an intolerable situation" that suffragists should have to make this appeal, and names as the prime advantage of a Federal amendment that women would be "freed from the humiliation of personal appeals to the individual voters, and could concentrate their efforts on the legislatures," where, she says, the "lowest" type of citizens are not often found. Hostile legislators, she adds, "could possibly be relegated to private life." She dreams, apparently, of a general adoption of the secret lobby method which was used to get the limited suffrage bill through the Illinois legislature; but anything will serve which takes away from "the masses of voters" the right to express their views upon the question.

The proposed Federal suffrage amendment is undemocratic in another way. It provides a means by which a minority of the population of the United States might override the wishes of the majority and force woman suffrage upon them. In the ratification of an amendment, the states count as states, without reference to population. The suffrage proposal would make Nevada, with a population of 81,875, as powerful in deciding the result, as New York, with a population of 9,113,379; Wyoming, with a population of 145,965, would count for as much as Pennsylvania, with a population of 7,665,111; and so on, up and down the list of states.

Here are twelve states which, on a popular vote, would be reasonably certain to reject a suffrage amendment to their constitutions:

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Texas and Massachusetts.

The combined population of these twelve states is 47,255,333. The combined population of the other thirty-six states is only 44,321,508. Yet,

through the device of a Federal constitutional amendment, it would be possible for a population of only 44,321,508 to force woman suffrage upon a population nearly 3,000,000 larger.

It is easy to see why this device commends itself to the suffragists, but it should be resented and resisted by every one who believes in that time-honored principle of democracy,—the rule of the majority.

SOME OF THE WOMEN WHO
OPPOSE

(From the Brooklyn Times, July 16, 1915)

Mrs. Robert L. Lansing, wife of the Secretary of State, has just joined the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Mrs. Lansing thus takes her stand with many other wives of leading statesmen among the active opponents of woman suffrage, including Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. George W. Wickersham, Mrs. Charles S. Fairchild, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston (formerly Mrs. Grover Cleveland) and Mrs. William H. Taft.

SUFFRAGE AND PATRIOTISM

(From the Des Moines, Iowa, Capital)

WHEN prominent feminists like Mrs. Lawrence, Dr. Anna Shaw and Miss Addams, refer to the war as a "dog fight," or the "hysteria of the male sex," and a proof of the incapacity of men longer to manage the affairs of the world; when practically every argument they bring forth deals only with the suffering it inflicts upon women who are erroneously presumed to be unanimously opposed to the war, and there is hardly a word of sympathy for the men who have followed the call of duty to face danger and death; when it is blindly affirmed that the war is caused simply by love of fighting characteristic of the brutal male, while women, being of finer moral constitution, are above such sentiments, we may be sure that these leaders are not only afflicted with a spiritual incapacity to appreciate the ideals which are inspiring some of the most heroic deeds in all the world, but they reveal a disposition to regard the feminist movement as a cause of antagonism to men, and that is pure folly.

BACKWARD CALIFORNIA

Suffragists are in the habit of pointing to California as a model State in progressive and humanitarian legislation. On the other hand, they insist that English laws are so unjust and oppressive as abundantly to justify the wildest militant outrages.

Yet there are some important particulars in which California lags behind Great Britain in laws for the protection of women and children.

California forbids the employment of minors between the hours of 10 P. M. and 5 A. M. British law forbids their employment between the hours of 7 P. M. and 6 A. M.

In California, the maximum penalty for rape is fifty years in State prison; in England, it is penal servitude for life. In California, the minimum penalty is one year; in Great Britain, it is two years. This has been the law for more than fifty years.

In California, a minor may assign wages, if it is done in writing, and with the written consent of parent or guardian. But in Great Britain, all contracts by persons under 21 for the repayment of money lent or for goods are void, and no debt contracted under the age of 21 can be enforced after majority is attained.

Recent legislation in California requires that seats must be provided for women at work in shops. The British Shop Act made the same provision as long ago as 1899.

Recent legislation in California has established an Industrial Welfare Commission, to fix hours of employment, standard conditions of labor and minimum wage. Great Britain has had for six years a Trade Board, empowered to fix a minimum wage in such industries as are scheduled.

California has a Juvenile Court. Great Britain has had them since 1908, with provisions for the separate detention of boys and girls.

In California, married women

are enabled to sue and be sued separately in certain cases; in Great Britain, they have had this privilege since 1882, and a married woman who recovers damages in this way holds them as her separate property.

This comparison might be extended; but the foregoing instances are sufficient to show that "votes for women" are not essential to the enactment of just laws in the interest of women and children.

"TYRANT MAN" IN NEW YORK

"Tyrant man" in New York, as in Massachusetts, enjoys the advantage of living under "man-made laws." Through cruel injustice, the women of New York, like those of Massachusetts, have been denied the privilege of voting and law-making. They are, in consequence, victims of many "inequalities." Here are a few of them:

Tyrant man in New York, as in Massachusetts, cannot touch his wife's property. If he wants to sell his own real estate, he cannot do so unless his wife will sign the papers. He must support his wife and minor children; and is liable for his wife's bills. But, if his wife is rich, and he has not a dollar to his name, she cannot be required to pay anything for his support. If his wife sues him for divorce, he must pay her lawyer's fees, even though it is proved that there was no ground for action. If his wife obtains a divorce, he must pay her alimony as long as she lives. But if the case is the other way round, and he obtains a divorce from his wife for just cause, she does not have to pay anything for his support, however rich she may be.

A man's widow is endowed with one third of all the real estate owned by him at the time of his death; but a husband has not even a courtesy right in the real property of a deceased wife, unless a living child has been born to them, and the wife may defeat even this right

by selling or giving away her property or devising it by will.

These are a few of the "painful inequalities" now existing in New York. There are others like them. When the suffragists clamor for "equal rights," are these some of the inequalities that they want abolished? If so, it would add zest to the campaign if they would come out frankly and say so.

THE St. Paul Pioneer-Press is well within bounds when it says that "the difficulty of convincing men to force the ballot upon unconvinced women is well nigh insurmountable." The Massachusetts suffragists are finding it so.

BEFORE legislative committees this year, both in Maine and Connecticut, suffragist speakers urged the need of a woman's prison, and insisted that, if women were given the ballot, they would see to it that such an institution was established. They seem to have been ignorant of the fact that there is not a single suffrage State which has a woman's prison. Massachusetts established one as long ago as 1874, and the leader in the movement for it was a prominent anti-suffragist. There are women's prisons also in New York, New Jersey, Michigan and Indiana, all male-suffrage states.

STAND BY THE WOMEN

THE WOMEN OF MASSACHUSETTS, NUMBERING 1,074,485, WERE DENIED THE RIGHT, THROUGH SUFFRAGE ACTIVITIES, TO VOTE ON THE SUFFRAGE QUESTION.

THEREFORE THEY LOOK TO THE MEN OF MASSACHUSETTS TO KEEP THEM FROM BEING THRUST INTO POLITICS AGAINST THEIR WILL.

IF YOU THINK THE WOMAN OF THE HOME A BETTER TYPE THAN THE WOMAN OF CROSS-COUNTRY "HIKES" AND SOAP-BOX ORATORY

VOTE "NO" ON THE SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

SHALL THE TAIL WAG THE DOG?



THE UNDERWORLD IN POLITICS

Eastern suffragists resent indignantly the intimation that, if women are given the ballot, the women of the underworld will use it freely, at the bidding of the forces of evil.

But this is precisely what happens in the suffrage states. Miss Helen L. Sumner, ardent suffragist though she is, frankly admits the fact. Reporting on conditions in Colorado, in her work on "Equal Suffrage," she says (pages 83 and 84):

"It is often said by equal-suffrage advocates that, if given the franchise, prostitutes would not vote, as they would not be interested and would not wish to give their names and addresses. This is a fallacy. True, they do not wish to vote. In the spring of 1895, they even sent a petition to the Woman's Republican Club of Denver, imploring the interference of that organization to prevent them from being compelled to register. But in spite of the request of the Republican women and the promise of the fire and police board, they were obliged to register and vote at the city election of 1895, and they have been obliged to register and vote at nearly every election since that date.

Prostitutes generally vote, and their vote is cast solidly for the party in control of the police force. This is true not only in Denver, but usually in Pueblo, Cripple Creek, and Trinidad, and often in other cities. To any one familiar with practical politics, where "the end" is held to "justify the means," this fact is not surprising. The vote of these women, to whom police protection is essential, is regarded as one of the perquisites of the party in power.

Neither is it surprising to learn that the prostitutes vote not only once, but often more than once. Whenever "repeating" is to be done, their aid, naturally, is required. "Repeating" is usually effected on fraudulent registrations, though occasionally an innocent person goes to the polls to find that some one has voted on his name, and that he is thereby disfranchised. Registration-books are most easily and unobtrusively "padded," as the saying is, in the rooming-house and red-light districts. Sometimes thirty or forty persons have been registered from small houses in this region where on inves-

tigation only six or eight legal voters could be discovered."

What is true in Colorado and California and other suffrage states would be true in Massachusetts, under similar conditions. If Massachusetts voters should force the ballot upon women, against the wishes of the great majority of them, it would be the duty of respectable and right-minded women, at whatever sacrifice, to vote regularly, to offset the increased influence of the underworld and the forces controlling it.

SEX-COMPETITION AND WAGES

HAVE Massachusetts men wage-earners ever stopped to ask themselves what the practical result would be, if, under woman suffrage, the suffragist idea of "economic independence" for women were to be carried out?

This idea involves promiscuous sex-competition in the labor market. It means women crowding in everywhere to do or try to do the jobs of men. It means, as suffrage leaders teach, that "ten-minutes-a-day house-keeping" shall be ample for a really ambitious woman, and that women, feeling no more obligation to the home than men feel, shall go out into offices, shops and industries to do men's work.

When there is only a limited amount of work to be done, and twice as many workers as are needed for it are standing around looking for jobs, what happens to wages? Do they move up or down? Doesn't the old law of supply and demand count here as elsewhere?

We are not left to theory in this matter. The suffrage State of California furnishes evidence as to how the thing works out. Mrs. Katharine P. Edson, of the California State Welfare Commission testified before the Federal Industrial Relations Commission, Sept. 10, 1914, as follows:

"No doubt a large part of our social trouble, such as the children in the street, is due to men working for an inadequate wage, and women being

forced to go out and work. It seems to me a hopeless situation. My opinion is that *there are more women outside their homes here than there should be.*"

There we have official testimony as to the working out of the suffrage ideals in a suffrage State,—men workers underpaid, women workers competing with them and keeping wages down, and children roaming the streets.

Massachusetts men who fancy such conditions can help to bring them about by voting "Yes" on the suffrage amendment next November.

THE SUFFRAGE BLUEBIRD

(From the Springfield Republican)

We suppose that the bluebird the suffragists have in mind is not really the familiar member of the thrush family, but the Bluebird of Happiness described so beautifully in Maeterlinck's fairy play which everybody ought to see. But we wonder whether the thought was a happy one. It will be remembered that Tyltyl and Mytyl in their search for happiness visited the Land of Memory, the Palace of Night, the Palace of Happiness and the Kingdom of the Future, thinking vainly they would see the bluebird, only to find it at last in their own home. Will the ballot bring to woman a greater happiness or open up to her a wider sphere of usefulness and influence than she now finds in her own home? Has not the Bluebird really been there all the time, its song unheard, its form unrecognized?

SUFFRAGE AND THE HOME

(From the Watertown, N. Y., Standard, July 26, 1915.)

Judge Lindsey's fame is based upon the failure of parents and churches in Denver, Col. The city so beautifully placed by Nature is noted chiefly from coast to coast for the urchins it breeds and neglects. . . . When a city in which mothers have voted for years turns out a crop of boys so bad that a man gets a world-wide reputation for stepping in and taking the role of father and mother to the army, one is lost for evidence that the ballot has improved or strengthened the mother in the greatest task before her, the rearing of children who will be decent men and women.

"EQUALITY, PLUS"

MISS MARJORIE DORMAN, at the state Anti-Suffrage Convention at Springfield, very justly said that what woman needs is "equality plus."

This is what Massachusetts women already have. Wage earning women have the benefit of all the protective laws which men workers have, plus many laws passed for their special protection. There are special laws limiting their hours of labor, prohibiting their employment at night, requiring for them adequate periods of rest, making compulsory the provision of seats for their comfort, regulating their minimum wage.

Married wage earning or salary earning women have all the rights that their husbands have and more. They may take as much time as they please away from their homes to earn money on their separate account, and their husbands cannot touch their earnings. Their husbands have no right to their services beyond what they choose to give; but the obligation of the husbands to support their wives remains in full force, notwithstanding. The wage earning wife, the woman exemplifying "economic independence," may keep a tight hold on her earnings, but her husband must pay her bills.

The property-owning wife enjoys a like "equality plus." Any property, real or personal, which she owns, or which comes to her by gift or bequest, or which she acquires through her business, trade or industry is absolutely hers. It is not liable for her husband's debts, and he cannot in any way control or interfere with it. But here again the husband's responsibility for the maintenance of his wife and children remains unchanged. If she chances to be very rich and he very poor, he has no claim upon her for a dollar of her property; but he is liable for her debts, so long as he has any money to meet them with, except that he is not responsible for contracts which she may make in connection with her separate property or trade.

So far as women wage-earners are concerned, this principle of "equality plus" is fully sustained by a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court. The Court was called upon to decide the constitutionality of a California law, limiting the time during which women should work in factories and other establishments to eight hours a day. In upholding the law, the Court used the following language, quoted from *Muller vs. Oregon*, in referring to woman:

"She is properly placed in a class by herself, and legislation designed for her protection may be sustained, even when like legislation is not necessary for men and could not be sustained . . . even though all restrictions on political, personal and contractual rights were taken away, and she stood, so far as the statutes are concerned, upon an absolutely equal plane with him, it would still be true that she is so constituted that she will rest upon and look to him for protection; that her physical structure and a proper discharge of her maternal functions—having in view not merely her own health, but the well-being of the race—justify legislation to protect her from the greed as well as the passion of man. The limitations which this statute places upon her contractual powers, upon her right to agree with her employer as to the time she shall labor are not imposed solely for her benefit, but also largely for the benefit of all. Many words cannot make this plainer. The two sexes differ in structural body, in the functions to be performed by each, in the amount of physical strength, in the capacity for long-continued labor, particularly when done standing, the influence of vigorous health upon the future well-being of the race, the self-reliance which enables one to assert full rights, and in the capacity to maintain the struggle for existence."

The principles which have led American men to legislate for the protection and welfare of American women could hardly be better expressed than in this decision of the highest American tribunal. They are exemplified in page after page of Massachusetts statutes, and not all the suffrage soap-box oratory at street corners will persuade Massachusetts men and women to the contrary.

NOT A GOOD EXAMPLE

It was an act of rather doubtful wisdom for Massachusetts suffragists to bring forward Mrs. Lister Watson of Australia as a witness to the good results of woman suffrage in that colony. Australia has a compulsory registration law, which applies equally to men and women, but the Official Year-Book of the Commonwealth of Australia gives the statistics of the last three elections, in 1903, 1906 and 1910, in not one of which did 57 per cent. of the registered women cast their votes, and adds this comment: "In every instance the percentage of female voters is very far below that of the males."

On the point of "equal pay for equal work," also, Australia is not a good example for the uses of the suffragists. So excellent a suffragist authority as Miss Jessie Ackerman, in her "Australia from a Woman's Point of View," frankly says:

"Although women in Australia enjoy partial equality with men in relation to citizenship, a sense of justice has never extended so far as to include the same standard for the sexes, either in pay for service or a similar code of laws for men and women. . . . I have before me the Federal and State reports concerning salaries and wages paid to government employees. In no case since women have had the vote has there been an increase in their wages bringing remuneration up to that of men in any department where both sexes are employed."

IS IT WORTH WHILE

TO BRING IN AN UNTRAINED BODY OF VOTERS WHICH WOULD OUTNUMBER THE PRESENT VOTERS IN THE STATE?

TO FORCE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BALLOT UPON ALL WOMEN AT THE DEMAND OF LESS THAN TEN PER CENT. OF THEM?

TO ADD FIFTY PER CENT. TO ELECTION COSTS AND TO DOUBLE ELECTION MACHINERY WITHOUT ANY COMPENSATING ADVANTAGE?

**IF YOU THINK IT ISN'T
VOTE "NO" ON THE SUFFRAGE
AMENDMENT**

SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM

A Cambridge suffragist describes as "pathetic" the statement of anti-suffragists that suffrage is allied with Socialism, and declares that "Nothing can be farther from the truth." In support of this surprising contention she quotes Miss Alice Stone Blackwell's booklet on "Suffrage and Socialism."

But Miss Blackwell is herself an avowed Socialist, and exemplifies in her own person that alliance between the two causes which, in her booklet, she undertakes to minimize. Miss Blackwell admits that all Socialists have woman suffrage in their "theoretical platform," but she alleges that "many of them confess that they do not want it to come until Socialism comes, just because they believe that it would delay the coming of Socialism." It would have added interest to Miss Blackwell's booklet if she could have found space to name these Socialists and quote their utterances.

Miss Jessie Ashley, who was formerly Treasurer of the National Woman Suffrage Association, and at that time closely identified with the Woman's Journal, is now identified with "The Progressive Woman," a Socialist paper published in Chicago. That paper says editorially:

"GET SOMETHING DONE. Bring Socialism to the attention of women voters and suffragists. They are fighting for justice. And by fighting for justice they are fighting the capitalist system which exists by injustice alone. **ACT! MOVE! HUSTLE!** for the realization of our slogan: **A HALF MILLION SOCIALIST WOMEN VOTERS** in 1916, and a **50 PER CENT. WOMAN MEMBERSHIP** in the Socialist party."

There is no concealment there of the alliance between Suffrage and Socialism. The Socialists have their faults, but lack of candor is not one of them.

Whenever a campaign is on, and a suffrage amendment is pending, it is the cue of many of the suffragist

leaders to turn a cold shoulder, temporarily, upon the Socialists and to disavow all connection between the two movements. But the Socialists see no need of concealment. With an ardor which must seem to Miss Blackwell and some others most inconsiderate, they go right on whooping up the alliance. Witness the following, from a recent editorial in the Socialist organ, the New York Call:

"The opportunity for the Socialist voters at the next election is too good to be overlooked or neglected. So far, we have not helped much, and our woman Comrades have every reason to emphasize that fact. But in these matters it is never too late to help. The last lap is being run and the Socialist voters should use extra and special efforts to push the cause of woman suffrage past the winning post."

Also this direct appeal from Eugene V. Debs, the Socialist Presidential candidate in 1912, published in the New York Call last August:

"It would be sheer betrayal of our party to let this great opportunity go by unimproved. The Socialist propaganda can be made to throb with new life and progress as never before in these Eastern States if the Socialists throw in their lot with the women and fight with all their energy to put through the suffrage amendment in November, and if this is not done it will simply mean that the Socialist party is unable to measure up to its greatest opportunity."

That woman suffrage has already added materially to the strength of Socialism is apparent by the vote at the last Presidential election. The six full-suffrage states in which women were qualified to vote at that election gave Debs, the Socialist Presidential candidate, 159,496 votes. The six New England States, with a population nearly a million and a half larger, gave him only 30,170 votes.

What the Socialists want is to increase their strength, through women's votes, in New England and

other Eastern States. Their hope, wherever woman suffrage is adopted, is a reasonable one, because it is based on experience in the States which already have woman suffrage. This is their "slogan." It is for this that they exhort each other to "act, move, hustle."

This makes an awkward situation for Massachusetts suffragists, at the present stage of the campaign. But, if there is anything "pathetic" in the situation, as the Cambridge suffragist suggests, it is not that anti-suffragists call attention to these conditions, but that the suffragists try so hard to wriggle away from them.

A STRIKE THAT WAS CALLED OFF

FORMALLY approved by the New York Suffrage Committee on the 24th of August, and precipitately abandoned by the same committee the day after, the projected "one-day strike" of women in industry and business for the furtherance of "votes for women" is a striking illustration of the recklessness of the suffrage leaders. If they had not been frightened out of it at the last moment, the Empire State Campaign Committee would have endangered the positions of thousands of women and occasioned, as they announced beforehand "a tremendous loss to employers and employees alike" merely to show, what every one knows already, that a good many women are employed outside their homes. If anything were needed to wreck the suffrage cause in New York, such an adoption of I. W. W. methods would have done it.

ARKANSAS is the first state to secure a complete child-labor law through the initiative. By popular vote a measure has been adopted which provides that children under 16 may not be employed for more than 8 hours a day, nor for more than 48 hours a week, nor before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m. That compares favorably with conditions in Colorado.

THE REAL REASON

Anti-suffragists are often the subjects of criticism, and sometimes of vituperation on the part of suffragists, on the ground of their supposed indolence or selfishness. They are described contemptuously as a "leisure class," although the fact is that, woman for woman, they are quite as busy and busy about quite as useful things as the women who demand the ballot. And they are told that, if they "do not want to vote," there is no good reason why they should stand in the way of women who do want to.

But the real reason why conservative, broad-minded and earnest women are opposing woman suffrage is not that they want to shirk personal responsibility. If they believed that it was their duty to take an equal part with men in governing cities, states and the nation, they would try to do their duty, at any cost or sacrifice. It is because they not only do not believe this to be their duty, but because they believe that woman suffrage involves a great loss to womanhood, and serious perils to the state that they feel it necessary to oppose it with all their strength.

And on what is this feeling grounded? On theory? In part, yes. Merely as a matter of theory, it does not seem worth while to add a new burden to those that women are already carrying unless some great benefit is to come from it. It does not seem wise to divert the energies of women from the home, from the care of children, from their accustomed work, from charitable and religious activities, into political channels, unless it is quite clear that either woman or the community is to gain by it. It seems a waste of strength to set two people to doing the work of one, if there is no proof that the work will be better done.

All this as a matter of theory. But women do not ground their opposition to woman suffrage upon theory only, but upon experience and observation. They find the old type of suf-

frage leadership, which sincerely advocated moral reform, and believed that it could accomplish something for temperance, giving place to a wholly new type, which publicly disclaims affiliation with the W.C. T. U., enters every state campaign with assurances to the saloon interests that they have nothing to fear from woman suffrage, and, through its National President, declares: "Just what the position of women voters upon the liquor problem will be has never been guessed, much less stated by suffrage associations. The opinions of individual suffragists are as varied as are those of anti-suffragists," and, through its state President in Ohio affirms that the suffrage association "has no connection whatever with the Anti-Saloon League," and, through its state President in Michigan, states that "The temperance issue has nothing to do with woman suffrage."

In the old days, the suffrage leaders agreed in claiming that women's votes would purify politics and secure better legislation. But, today, the really responsible leaders have abandoned this position. They agree with Judge Lindsey in saying that women are no better than men, and that they divide as men do; and with Mrs. Turner of Denver, who says: "As for the old question, 'Will women uplift and purify politics?' the answer to that is: Why should they be expected to?" and with Dr. Shaw, who affirms that "Facts as to the results of equal suffrage have no bearing on our question."

There are reasons for this change of front. The practical workings of suffrage have disproved the promises made by the earlier suffrage enthusiasts. After twenty two years of suffrage, Colorado remains a welter of corrupt politics, of demoralizing social conditions, of disorganized and ineffective government. The best laws for the protection of women and children are not found in suffrage, but in male-suffrage states. In California, in Washington, and in other states where women are voting, there

are no improved conditions which justify the suffrage experiment.

It is because the suffrage movement has deteriorated womanhood, and has injured instead of helping the state,—and not for any selfish reason that women oppose it.

IT WAS a happy thought of the suffragists to select for their "Victory Day" a day prior to the elections. If they had put it off until afterward, they would have had to call it something different.

WYOMING has had woman suffrage 46 years, and Idaho 19 years, but it was not until this year that it occurred to either of them to place the property rights of wives and husbands on an equal footing.

ALABAMA and Georgia are to be added to the list of states—twenty in all—whose legislatures have rejected suffrage measures this year. It has been a bad year for the suffrage propaganda, and the worst defeats of all are just ahead.

SUFFRAGIST cartoons and streamers purport to speak for "four million women voters." But the fact is that, in the eleven full-suffrage states, there are only two million possible women voters—or, to be exact, 2,097,954.

THERE is one feature of the government of New Zealand which the suffragists never mention. Women there are allowed to vote, but they cannot sit in either branch of the Legislature. American suffragists insist that men can never "represent" women; but they do it in New Zealand, so far as the practical work of legislation goes.

ACCORDING to Miss Sophonisba Breckenridge, the use of the vote is the same as the use of any labor-saving device: "If a woman does not want to use a vacuum cleaner she need not, neither need she use suffrage unless she wishes to." What have the Oregon women to say to this, who are already threatened with a compulsory voting law?

WOMEN'S WORKING HOURS

Last year, five states—all of them male-suffrage states—and the Federal Government enacted laws affecting favorably the working hours and working conditions of women. The five states were Mississippi, Virginia, South Carolina, New York and Massachusetts.

The most favorable law was enacted at Washington, by the same Congress which voted against woman suffrage. It established for women an eight-hour day, and a six-day week of forty-eight hours; prohibited the employment of females under 18 before 7 a. m. or after 6 p. m.; and provided a staff of three inspectors, two of whom must be women. The act applies to any manufacturing, mechanical or mercantile establishment, laundry, hotel, restaurant, telegraph or telephone office, or to any express or transportation company, in the District of Columbia.

SUFFRAGE AND CHILD LABOR

In Colorado, where women have been voting for twenty-two years, boys of any age, and girls over ten are allowed to engage in street trades.

In Washington, where women have had the suffrage since 1910, any child, boy or girl, ten years of age or over, is permitted to beg or peddle or sing on the street for gain.

In Utah, where women have been "mothering the community" through their ballots for nineteen years, boys of twelve and girls of sixteen may sell newspapers on the streets, and girls of twelve may black the shoes of the casual passer-by.

What it means to have children engaged in street trades, blacking shoes and selling newspapers, is indicated by Mr. Edward N. Clopper, of the National Child Labor Committee, who says:

The largest number of delinquent boys is found in those occupations in which the nature of the employment does not permit supervision, namely,

newspaper selling, errand running, delivery service and messenger service. Boys engaged in these occupations, together with bootblacks and peddlers, all work under conditions which bring them into continual temptations to dishonesty and other offenses."

If this is true of boys, it can scarcely be less true of girls. There is perhaps not much to choose; for the report of the Child Labor Committee for November, 1913, says:

"It is scarcely more perilous for girls than it is for boys to sell papers, peddle gum, guide beggars, black shoes and tend stands or engage in any other form of street trading."

Yet, while these suffrage states, with women voting, and with women in their legislatures, ignore these perils to childhood, male suffrage states, by "man-made laws," are extending protection over boys and girls. Wisconsin sets an age limit of eighteen for girls in street trades; and forbids boys under twelve to sell newspapers, and boys under fourteen to engage in any other form of street trade. New York has raised from ten to twelve years the minimum age of boys permitted to sell papers on the street, and forbids them to sell papers after eight o'clock in the evening, instead of after ten o'clock, as formerly. Massachusetts limits the hours of labor for children under eighteen to eight per day; and forbids the employment of boys or girls under sixteen in factories, workshops or mercantile establishments.

It is Pennsylvania,—a male-suffrage state where the suffragists are making an active campaign on the ground that women's votes are indispensable to the welfare of the community—which has taken the lead this year in child labor legislation. The new Pennsylvania child-labor law forbids children under fourteen to work for compensation except in vacations, and then only those over twelve may be employed. It allows children of from fourteen to sixteen to work, but only on the condition that they attend continuation schools. It fixes a maximum day of nine hours for

minors between fifteen and sixteen, and of eight hours for those between fourteen and fifteen. It does not allow minors to be employed as messengers between the hours of 8 p. m. and 6 a. m. It forbids boys under fourteen to sell newspapers or to engage in other street trades, and it does not allow girls under eighteen to be so employed at all.

Perhaps the extreme suffragists will object that this larger measure of protection for girls violates the principle of "equal rights" for the sexes; just as the Denver women protested when the city council tried to protect women against the saloons, and as the Woman's Journal protested when the Post Office Department tried to protect women at the General Delivery windows; but to most sane people, it will seem a wise provision. It contrasts favorably with the laxity which prevails in Colorado, Utah and other suffrage states.

A CORRESPONDENT of the New York Evening Post asks:

"Did any rational being, in any country on earth, at any stage of the world's history, or under any circumstances, ever seriously propose to confer the benefit or impose the burden of the suffrage on any class of people whatever among whom there was determined and organized resistance to receiving it?"

That question was propounded months ago, but up to date, no suffragist has come forward to answer it.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE CAMPAIGN MANUAL

By Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee

Is a little Book especially prepared to present the woman suffrage question in a clear and concise manner to those seeking information on the subject. The principal points at issue are carefully considered and all figures used are from the United States Census.

Mrs. Leatherbee is Chief of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Bureau of Information, and the Book is officially endorsed by this Association. Copies may be procured at our Office, or ordered from us by mail, for 15 cents each.

WOMEN'S ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION OF MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston

Mrs. John Balch, President

Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Secretary